



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/084,355	10/084,355 02/28/2002		Michiaki Sakamoto	8018-1003	5587	
466	7590	03/29/2004		EXAMINER		
YOUNG &			WANG, GEORGE Y			
745 SOUT ARLINGT		FREET 2ND FLOOR 22202		ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	•			2871		

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/084,355	SAKAMOTO ET AL.
Advisory Aution	Examiner	Art Unit
	George Y. Wang	2871
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 08 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application applic	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content of	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mains.	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
<ul> <li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
$3. \square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):`	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi <u>e Continuation Sheet</u> .	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10.  ☐ Other:		
	Supe Te	ROBERT H. KIM RVISORY PATENT EXAMINER CHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's colored figures are appreciated but Applicant's arguments nevertheless remain unpersuasive. First, Applicant argues that the Tagusa reference does not teach a control electrode that is "disposed under said gap between adjacent pixel electrodes." Broadly interpreted, the control electrode is positioned "under" the gap, albeit not directly under. Second, Applicant argues that the control electrode does not "cover said gate line." One of the definitions for the "cover" in Webster's Dictionary is "to lay something over." Broadly interpreted, the control electrode is situated over the gate line, satisfying the language of "cover" in the claim. Lastly, in an attempt to overcome the rejection, Applicant's previously amended claim language "as seen in plan view" does little to emphasize the position of these elements. After all, a dotted-line drawing of the control electrode would suffice to show that it was "under" the gap even if it is "as seen in plan view".